

REMARKS

In the final office action dated October 3, 2007, all pending claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-22 and 60 were rejected. Claims 23-59 and 61 have been withdrawn earlier. In response, Applicant is amending claims 1-2 and 60. Claims 1 and 60 are the pending independent claims. Dependent claims 18-19 are being canceled without prejudice. As such, claims 1-13, 16-17, 21-22 and 60 are pending. Favorable consideration of the claims as amended is requested.

The present amendments

Independent claims 1 and 60 are being amended to address issues that were raised in the office action based on Applicant's earlier amendment. Applicant does not concede that the rejections have merit but rather submits that the earlier amendment finds full support in the present disclosure. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant is amending the claims and provides the following explanation of how the claim language is supported.

Claims 1 and 60 recite steps (labeled (1) and (2)) that can be taken depending on whether or not a server device has provided a request to a server device. The specification gives examples of such requests that a server device can provide, including: an undo request 218A and a redo request 218B (spec. 5:31—6:5). Importantly, and as described in the specification, when the client device executes such a request 218A or 218B, the client device generates the undo or redo request to the server device. See spec. 7:9-10 (“an undo request 218A *that the client device can make ...*”) and 8:24 (triggering “the client device *to send the redo request 218B*”) (emphases added).

For the Examiner's convenience, Applicant provides the following table with examples of where the claim language is supported (citations are to the original disclosure).

Claim language	Example of support
1. (Currently amended) A method of providing navigation in a browser, the method comprising:	Claim 1 as originally filed.
displaying an <u>a</u> first application page in a browser on a client device, the <u>first</u> application page being received from a server device and relating to a first state of an application program on the server device, the browser having a back function and a forward function;	Claim 1 as originally filed.
receiving an input from a user while the <u>first</u> application page is being displayed, the input requesting one of the back function and the forward function; and	Claim 1 as originally filed.
determining whether the server device has specified a request as being associated with the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the application page, the request instructing the server device to change the application program from the first state to a <u>second state</u> ; and	

Claim language	Example of support
<p><u>(1) if the server device has provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, the request instructing the server device to change the application program from the first state to a second state, generating the provided request to the server device in response to receiving the input and receiving at the client device and displaying in the browser a second application page provided by the server device in response to receiving the request if the request has been specified, else;</u></p>	<p><i>Regarding the "request":</i></p> <p>The server device 204 can provide code 214 to the client device 202, which instructs the client device which action(s) 218 to perform (5:31—6:2).</p> <p>The code 214 can include an undo request 218A (7:8) and a redo request 218B (8:20).</p> <p>The undo request can be made by the client device to the server device when the user activates the Back button (7:1-10). Similarly, the redo request can be made by the client device to the server device when the user activates the Forward button (8:19-23).</p> <p>Thus, the present disclosure describes that the server device can provide a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page.</p>
	<p><i>Regarding the "second application page":</i></p> <p>If the user clicks the Back button at time T1 (FIG. 1B), the server can provide the application page 106A for display in the browser at time T2 (FIG. 1C) (4:15-22).</p> <p>If the user clicks the Forward button at time T2 (FIG. 1C) the server can provide the application page 106B for display in the browser at time T3 (FIG. 1D) (4:24-30).</p>
<p><u>(2) if the server device has not provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, not requesting a change to the first state in response to the input and continuing to display the first application page.</u></p>	<p>The server device 204 can provide a continue instruction 218C in the code 214 which causes the client device 202 to continue displaying the application page (7:17-20; 9:1-4).</p>

Thus, the language of claim 1 (and independent claim 60) as amended finds full support in the present disclosure. The word “first” is added to dependent claim 2 for consistency.

No new matter is added.

Rejections under sections 112 and 101

The rejections are moot in view of the above amendments. Applicants does not concede that the rejections have merit, but provide the following comments regarding the issues raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-22 and 60 were rejected under § 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description due to the phrase “determining ...” which was then in claims 1 and 60.

The phrase at issue has been omitted from claims 1 and 60. The language that is now being added to claims 1 and 60 is fully supported by the present disclosure as shown above.

Claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-22 and 60 were rejected under § 112, first paragraph, as not enabled by the disclosure because “[t]he limitation that the client device may continue displaying the application page depending on the ability of the program to undo the request (sic) which is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure.”

First, Applicant submits that the rejection is articulated in a summary fashion and does not state any basis for the Examiner’s analysis, making it difficult for Applicant to understand why the Examiner has come to the conclusion that certain subject matter must be included in the claim. Also, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s expression “undo the request” appears to be based on a misunderstanding: Applicant describes that a “request” can be generated to undo a measure that has been taken (7:10-16).

Second, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 60 as amended do set forth that the first application page can continue to be displayed if the server has not provided a request that the client device can generate. There should be no question that the present disclosure describes and enables a method where the client device as an outcome either displays a second application page (i.e., step (1)) or continues to display the first application page (i.e., step (2)).

Claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-22 and 60 were rejected under § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner stated that the result of the invention is merely numerical values without a practical application and stated that the claims must transform a physical article or object or produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Applicant submits that a practical application is expressly cited in the preamble of claim 1, namely: "providing navigation in a browser". This practical application is also inherent in the steps recited in claim 1: "displaying a first application page ..."; "receiving an input from a user ... requesting one of the back function and the forward function" and "displaying in the browser a second application page ..." or "continuing to display the first application page". The present specification also describes additional details as to the practical applications in using implementations of the present subject matter. As such, the claims do not merely involve calculations and manipulations of data, but rather have real and practical applications.

Moreover, the present claims do have a useful, concrete and tangible result, and this result is actually recited in the claims. The claims recite that a user input is received requesting one of the back function and the forward function in a browser. One result that can occur is that an undo (or redo) action is performed in response, and that the corresponding page is displayed to the user. Another result is obtained when an undo (or redo) cannot be performed; the current application page can then continue to be displayed. Both of these outcomes are useful in that the method lets the server device specify what to do when the user clicks on Back or Forward buttons. Moreover, in either situation there is a transformation; the user input is received and is transformed either into a generated request or to continued display of an application page. Thus, the result is concrete, tangible and useful.

Independent claim 60 is directed to a "computer program product containing executable instructions that when executed causes a processor to perform operations" that parallel the method steps of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 60 is in *Beauregard* format, which is a format that has been deemed sufficiently tangible to be considered statutory. *In re Beauregard*, 53 F.3d 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1995). In addition, the functions recited in the body of claim 60 parallel those set forth in independent claim 1, and therefore, for the reasons discussed previously in connection with claim 1, claim 60 similarly is not simply a manipulation of numbers, but rather is an apparatus that has useful applications and achieves a concrete, tangible result.

Claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-22 and 60 were rejected under § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite due to the claim language “server device has specified a request”. The Examiner stated “Applicant’s specification discloses that the user specifies the request and the server receives the request. Clarify.”

Claims 1 and 60 as amended state “if the server device has provided a request *to be made by the client device to the server device* regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the application page” (emphasis added). This language should resolve any issues regarding that it is the server device that can provide the request—e.g., place the undo request 218A (or the redo request 218B) on the client device—and that, if so provided, the request can be made by the client device to the server device.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the portion of the Examiner’s statement that reads “Applicant’s specification discloses that the user specifies the request”. If the Examiner is referring to the undo request 218A (or the redo request 218B), then Applicant submits that the specification describes the requests as being specified by the server device (e.g., at 7:5: “action(s) 218 specified by the server device 204”). If, on the other hand, the Examiner is referring to the user making an input, the specification describes such an input as being made when the user “activates the Back button 102” (7:1) or with other similar expressions. In either case, the language of the claim is clear and not indefinite.

Rejection under sections 102 and 103

Claims 1-13, 16-19, 22 and 60 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,011,537 (Slotznick). Claim 21 was rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Slotznick in view of U.S. 7,000,695 (Li).

Independent claims 1 and 60 have been discussed in detail above. In short, however, the method and operations recited in these claims set forth that a request can be specified by a server device to a client device, the request to be made by the client device to the server device. Also, if such a request has been specified, the method and operations can comprise generating the provided request to the server device, and receiving at the client device and displaying in the browser a second application page provided by the server device in response to receiving such a request.

Slotznick and Li were addressed in Applicant's response to the previous office action and those remarks are incorporated here. As explained in that earlier response, Slotznick fails to disclose or suggest that a request changing an application state be specified by a server. Slotznick also fails to disclose or suggest that a request provided by the server should be generated from the client device to the server device. Finally, Slotznick fails to disclose or suggest that the server device should provide a second application page in response to receiving the request, a page that is received at the client device and displayed in the browser.

It follows that Slotznick does not anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claims 1-13, 16-17, 22 and 60. These claims are therefore patentable over Slotznick.

Li was cited as allegedly showing another feature, but in any event does not provide the subject matter missing from Slotznick, and the Examiner did not contend as much. Accordingly, all pending claims are patentable over Slotznick and Li, taken separately or in combination.

Conclusion

Favorable consideration of the pending claims as amended is requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Uwe Klinger
Serial No. : 10/723,535
Filed : November 26, 2003
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 16104-015001 / 2003P00897
US

Date: 10/26/07

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60461348.doc

Respectfully submitted,



J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352